

**REMARKS**

Several minor typographical corrections have been made to the specification. Claims 7 - 8, 10, 21 - 22, 24, 35 - 36, and 38 have been amended. Claims 9, 23, and 37 have been cancelled from the application without prejudice. No new matter has been introduced with the corrections or amendments, which are supported in the specification as originally filed. Claims 7 - 8, 10, 21 - 22, 24, 35 - 36, and 38 are now in the application.

**I. Corrections to the Specification**

The word "not" has been added to the text on page 31, line 21 by amendment herein. By review of the paragraph in which this amendment is made, it can be seen that this is an obvious typographical error: instead of a "repeating loop" (see line 20), the loop is periodically executed, for example upon expiration of a timer (see p. 31, line 21 - p. 32, line 2). Therefore, amending this text to include the word "not" does not introduce new matter.

A reference to Fig. 3C has been added to page 43, line 2 for clarification. This text refers to the "delay monitor that was used for the first and second embodiments". By reference to p. 31, line 15 (first preferred embodiment), it can be seen that Fig. 3C is the figure depicting the delay monitor. See also p. 37, lines 6 - 8, discussing Fig. 3C with reference to the second preferred embodiment. Thus, this added reference does not introduce new matter.

On page 44, lines 2 - 3, the term "association context" has been corrected to "application context", to align with the earlier references. (See p. 39, line 16; p. 41, line 3; and p. 42, line 19.)

**II. Rejection under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph**

Paragraph 2 of the Office Action dated April 29, 2004 (hereinafter, "the Office Action") states that Claims 7 - 10, 21 - 24, and 35 - 38 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicant regards as the invention. The points raised in paragraph 2 have been addressed with the amendments herein, and the Examiner is respectfully requested to withdraw the §112 rejection.

**III. Rejection under 35 U.S.C. §102(e)**

Paragraph 3 of the Office Action states that Claims 8, 22, and 36 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Freund et al. (U. S. Patent 5,925,098). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Applicant's independent Claims 8, 22, and 36 contain limitations not taught by Freund. For example, these independent claims (as amended) all specify limitations of "receiving client connections on multiple pending connections queues" and "moving said client connections from said multiple pending connections queues to first queues associated therewith as each of said client connections is accepted by said application and confirmed by a client that requested said client connection". Freund has no teaching of "multiple pending connections queues", from which client connections are moved to "first queues associated therewith" as those client connections are accepted and confirmed.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that independent Claims 8, 22, and 36 are patentable over Freund (and that dependent Claims 10, 24, and 38 are therefore patentable over this reference as well). The Examiner is therefore respectfully requested to withdraw the §102 rejection of Claims 8, 22, and 36.

**IV. Allowable Claims**

Paragraph 4 of the Office Action states that independent Claims 7, 21, and 35 would be allowable if rewritten to overcome the §112 rejection. Applicant respectfully submits that the amendments made herein overcome the §102 rejection, and Claims 7, 21, and 35 are therefore deemed patentable as currently presented.

Paragraph 4 of the Office Action further states that dependent Claims 9 - 10, 23 - 24, and 37 - 38 would be allowable if rewritten to overcome the §112 rejection and to include all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Applicant respectfully submits that the amendments made herein to independent Claims 8, 22, and 36 (which incorporate limitations of now-cancelled dependent Claims 9, 23, and 37) render those claims patentable. Dependent Claims 10, 24, and 38 are therefore deemed patentable as well.

**V. Conclusion**


Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the pending rejected claims, withdrawal of all presently outstanding rejections, and allowance of all remaining claims at an early date.

Serial No. 09/852,366

-14-

Docket CR9-98-027B

Respectfully submitted,



Marcia L. Doubet  
Attorney for Applicant  
Reg. No. 40,999

Customer Number for Correspondence: 25260

Phone: 407-343-7586

Fax: 407-343-7587

Serial No. 09/852,366

-15-

Docket CR9-98-027B